



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/385,651	08/27/1999	MICHAEL GREMINGER	31949	9479
116	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP			FAULK, DEVONA E	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200			2644	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/385,651	GREMINGER, MICHAEL
	Examiner Devona E. Faulk	Art Unit 2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 12-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 12-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/28/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1,12-23 under 102 (b) and 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Engebreston.
2. Claims 2-11 are cancelled.
3. Claim 24 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. **Claim 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 14 recites the claim language "further comprising a testing unit that test the audio storage medium in said playback unit for a predetermined identification and which disables said playback unit on non-recognition of said predetermined identification". It is not clear that element reads on a testing unit. Additionally, page 15 recites "If the indicator KZ registered by means of the detector does not accord with the one previously stored in the storage device, then the playback of the medium just entered will be blocked in a control input E92 of the play-back unit, if

necessary the medium will be ejected and the situation will be indicated in a display unit". The claim should recite "disables playback of audio storage medium" .

6. **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 recites closes wherein said selection unit has a test signal/reaction signal pattern storage unit, an output of which is operationally connected to a first input of a comparing unit, said connection for data entry being operationally connected with a second input of said comparing unit, said comparing unit having an output operationally connected to said selection unit. Figure 6 does not indicate that comparing unit (35) having an output operationally connected to the selection unit (31). The output is connected to the amplifier control (36).

7. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 recites "a set-value comparing unit". The specification teaches of a comparing unit (35,Figure 6; page 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

((e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. **Claim 23** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Basseas (U.S. Patent 6,674,867).

Regarding **claim 23**, Basseas discloses a method for fitting a hearing device *insitu* (*insitu* is defined as in its natural position) (Figure 1) comprising the steps of:

applying a hearing device to an individual (Figure 1);
subjecting the individual to an audio test signal (column 4, lines 11-17);
having the individual appraise said audio test signal (column 4, lines 18-24);
and automatically selecting, in dependency of said appraising, a subsequent audio test signal (column 2, lines 36-48) (column 4, lines 5-column 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1,12,13,15,17,19, 20-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser et al. (WO 85/00509) in view of Engebreston et al. (US 4,548,082).

Regarding claim 1, Moser discloses a hearing device fitting device (Figure 1, Figure 16) comprising

 a computing device (308, Figure 16), (connected on an input side with a connection for data entry (human interfaces 68 and 70 Figure 1; 370 Figure 16) and

 and

 further comprising an audio storage medium play-back unit having a control input connected to a computing device output (Figure 16) and having an audio output connectable to a loudspeaker unit input (310, Figure 16) (pages 28, line 27-page 30) .

 wherein said computing device generates a control signal at said output depending on data input to said connection for data entry (page 29, lines 23-30).

 Moser in Figure 16 discloses communication between the control unit and the hearing aid.

 Moser fails to disclose but Engebreston discloses a computing device having an output side with a connection for a hearing device (Figure 1; output side connected to hearing aid worn by patient).

 It would have been obvious to modify Moser so that the output of the control unit is connected to a hearing device as taught by Engebreston in order to

automatically control the characteristics of the hearing aid (Engebreton, column 6, lines 46-48).

Regarding **claim 12**, Moser as modified by Engebreton discloses wherein said playback unit contains at least one audio storage chip Moser teaches of the playback unit as a compact disc player (52). He further teaches that the information stored on the compact disc (54) is listed in a stored table of contents (page 18, lines 30-33). There is therefore implicitly some sort of audio storage chip as claimed.

Regarding **claim 13**, Moser as modified by Engebreton wherein said playback unit is a CD playback unit. Moser teaches of the playback unit as a compact disc player (302). He further teaches that the information stored on the compact disc (304) is listed in a stored table of contents (page 28, lines 28-35).

Regarding **claim 15**, Moser as modified by Engebreton discloses further comprising a decoding unit, wherein said playback unit is an audio CD playback unit generating a specification of an extent of at least one of the segments on the audio storage medium in said playback unit, and wherein said specification is fed from an output of said playback unit to said decoding unit which then generates a control signal for the operation of said playback unit (Figure 16, page 28, line30-page 29, line 30).

Regarding **claim 16**, Moser as modified by Engebreton discloses the hearing device fitting device according to claim 1, wherein said fitting device further comprises a set-value comparing unit having an output operationally

connected to a level control input of said playback unit for controlling said audio – output (page 25, lines 2-7), wherein

the hearing device is connected to said hearing device output, the hearing device having a level detector (350, Figure 16) which is connected to an acoustical/electrical converter of the hearing device, such that said computing unit generates, on a level detector control output, a level detector control signal for controlling an operational connection between a level detector output of said level detector and a computing unit control input of said computing unit, said computing unit control input also operationally connected to said set-value comparing unit, and wherein

said computing unit enables said playback unit for playback of a predetermined storage segment of the audio storage medium upon receipt of a control signal on said computing unit control input (Figure 16, page 29, lines 17-30) , and further wherein

said computing unit controls establishing said operational connection of said level detector output to said computing unit control input (Figure 16, page 29, lines 17-30)

Regarding **claim 17**, Moser as modified by Engebreton discloses said computing unit further including a selection unit (Moser, X-Y tablet 68; page 15, lines 23-30; Figure 1), wherein said connection for data entry is connected to a human input device and is operationally connected with said selection unit, a selection output of said selection unit being operationally connected to said

selection input of said playback unit (page 29, lines 23-30; Figure 1 and Figure 16).

Regarding **claim 19**, Moser as modified by Engebreston discloses wherein said connection for data entry is connected to a human input device and to a decoding unit (disc player 52, Figures 13-15 and 302 in Figure 16; page 18, lines 18-27) which generates, from input data from said human input device, according to stored decoding tables, output data to an output of said decoding unit that is operationally connected with another input of said computing unit ((disc player 52, Figures 13-15 and 302 in Figure 16; page 18, lines 18-27; Figure 16, page 29, lines 23-30).

Claims 20 and 22 share common elements.

Regarding **claims 20 and 22**, Moser discloses a hearing device fitting arrangement (Figure 1 and Figure 16) comprising:

an audio storage playback unit (302,304, Figure 16) including:
a control input having a selection input for selecting one of a plurality of storage segments on an audio storage medium (page 29, lines 23-30); and
an audio output(speaker 310) ;
a loudspeaker operationally connectable to said audio output of said playback unit (310, Figure 16); and
a computing unit (308)including a data input for data entry (370)by an individual carrying a hearing device to be fitted insitu;

a hearing device output for operationally connecting to the hearing device (312);

and an audio control output for operationally connecting to said control input of said audio storage medium playback unit(Figure 16);

wherein said computing unit is adapted for automatically selecting the one of a plurality of storage segments depending on signals applied to said data input (page 28, lines 28-page 29).

The only difference between claim 20 and 22 is that claim 22 recites " a hearing device output for operationally connecting to the hearing device for programming said hearing device" where claim 20 recites "a hearing device output for operationally connecting to the hearing device".

Moser in Figure 16 discloses communication between the control unit and the hearing aid.

Moser fails to disclose but Engebreston discloses a computing device having an output side with a connection for a hearing device (Figure 1; output side connected to hearing aid worn by patient).

It would have been obvious to modify Moser so that the output of the control unit is connected to a hearing device as taught by Engebreston in order to automatically control the characteristics of the hearing aid (Engebreston, column 6, lines 46-48).

Regarding **claim 21**, Moser as modified by Engebreston discloses wherein said connection for data entry is connected to a human input device and

to a decoding unit (disc player 52, Figures 13-15 and 302 in Figure 16; page 18, lines 18-27) which generates, from input data from said human input device, according to stored decoding tables, output data to an output of said decoding unit that is operationally connected with another input of said computing unit ((disc player 52, Figures 13-15 and 302 in Figure 16; page 18, lines 18-27; Figure 16, page 29, lines 23-30).

12. **Claims 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser et al. (WO 85/00509) in view of Engebreston et al. (US 4,548,082) in further view of Geiger (US 4,807,208).

Regarding claim 14, Moser as modified by Engebreston fails to disclose but Geiger teaches of further comprising a testing unit that tests the audio storage medium in said playback unit for a predetermined identification and which disables said playback unit on non-recognition of said predetermined identification (column 3, lines 18-27 and lines 30-34). It would have been obvious to modify Moser as modified by Engebreston by having a test that determines if the audio storage medium matches some predetermined identification as taught by Geiger so that only desired marked pieces will be played (Geiger; column 3, lines 25-34)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devona E. Faulk whose telephone number is 571-272-7515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEF



HUVEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER